fully capable of being rotated about the needle hub since it does not necessarily have to be welded or bonded onto the device."

The statement that the examiner relied upon in Crawford for his assertion is the following: "Hub 60 then is joined with collar 90 by ultra-sonic welding techniques or any other bonding techniques or mechanical fit, whereby rearward annular skirt 94 of collar 90 mates with ribbed end 66 of the hub." [Second sentence of paragraph 0064.]

It is respectfully submitted that the examiner's reliance of the words "mechanical fit" for asserting that collar 90 is rotatable about needle hub 60 is misplaced, for in the very next sentence in [paragraph 0064] Crawford states: "Male ribs 82 of the hub are contained or force fitted within inner sidewall 102 of rearward annular skirt 94 of collar 90." This sentence makes it clear that the needle hub and the collar of the Crawford device are not to be rotatable, due to the parts being contained or force fitted. To a person skilled in the art, it would mean that there is no relative rotation between the two parts. In fact, lines 9-11 of [paragraph 0064], Crawford explains that the bevel of the needle 40 has to be aligned relative to the hook 114 (where needle protection shield 140 is hingedly held) that is on collar 90 per the following: "Collar 90 is aligned with the intravenous end of needle 40 whereby the hook 114 is aligned with the bevel [tip] of needle 40." This is needed so that the user can see how the needle enters into the patient. Were collar 90 to be rotatable relative to needle hub 60, then the bevel tip of the needle would not be in alignment with hook 114. This would defeat the purpose of the Crawford device. Indeed, there is no disclosure in Crawford that suggests that collar 90 and needle hub 60 are rotatable relative to each other. If anything, the teachings of Crawford indicate otherwise, i.e., that collar 90 is fixedly mounted to needle hub 60.

The examiner further argues that the "helical thread and corresponding thread" of the Crawford device is a rib and circumferential groove. Here applicants once more repeat that the helical thread 56 at sleeve 50 and the counter helical groove 97 at collar 90 of the Crawford device are not the same as a circumferential groove or a circumferential rib. By definition, the helical thread and corresponding groove are mated by turning whereas a

circumferential groove and rib are mated by being snapped together. This is basic mechanical engineering definition, even by resort to the broadest reasonable interpretation as alleged by the examiner.

B. Claims 8 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over the combination of Crawford and Landis (US 5,490,841). According to the examiner, Landis shows lips that are "angled toward the interior of the housing" as shown in Figs. 9a, 9b and 11.

It is respectfully submitted that the examiner is wrong insofar as the only thing that Figs. 9a and 9b of Landis show is that the housing of the alternate embodiment has two trap doors 120A and 120B. As far as can be ascertained, the fact that these trap doors abut each other in the closed position (column 8, lines 58-61) clearly means that there could not be any respective angles for the lips. Because if the lips of the Landis housing were angled as claimed, they would not be in abutment along the respective longitudinal edges thereof, per shown in Landis.

The arguments set forth in the prior Amendment are equally applicable with respect to the Johnson (2002/0010433) and Gyure (US 5,669,889) references, and accordingly are incorporated by reference herein.

C. Applicants now address the newly cited reference Pressly Sr. et al. (US 7,014,622), which was used in the rejection of claims 6, 11 and 13-19. According to the examiner, Pressly "provides a window via a transparent ring in order to see if the device has been properly connected."

It is respectfully submitted that Pressly does not disclose any window "via any transparent ring." Rather, as shown in Fig. 10A, Pressly discloses a transparent needle assembly 8 that is to be fitted to the syringe barrel 6 for enclosing the needle hub 2 during the manufacturing process of the Pressly device. See Fig. 1. With the needle assembly 8 being transparent, the user can then see the joining of the head 12 of the needle 14 to

the needle hub 2. Thus, needle assembly 8, be it transparent or otherwise, is not a ring, that is in spaced relationship with the luer connector. There is no luer connector disclosed in Pressly, as the Pressly device is a syringe with a specially designed needle hub that is adapted to have different types of needles connected thereto (column 5, lines 29-35). In fact, needle assembly 8 is permenanty joined to syringe barrel 6 (column 5, lines 59-63). Thus, to suggest that the syringe of Pressly may be combined with the double-ended needle of Crawford and further the adapter for a luer lock as disclosed in Johnson does not make any common sense, let alone be obvious to one skilled in the art.

In light of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the instant invention is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application and pass the same to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis Woo, Reg. No. 31,730
Law Offices of Louis Woo
717 North Fayette Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 299-4090

Date: Jun 8 2007